

Upon reading the PRSG's petition for reconsideration dated November 12, 2002, I feel compelled to object to paragraphs 4 through 10. While I concur with the nature of PRSG's objection to connecting MURS equipment to PSTN so as to prevent the extended use of a MURS channel (hogging) by telephone simplex autopatches, I object to the expanded definition of PSTN. The problem would seem to entail keeping a single user from tying up a MURS channel for an extend period of time as a telephone conversation would.

There may be a desire by some to collect telemetry data transmitted by users of MURS to either a LAN or a remote site on the internet (ie the APRS findu.com system). Since telemetry packets are short they would not pose an inconvenience to the voice users. It would seem that under the PRSG's suggestion, even one-way passive(radio to base) interconnects would be prohibited. At this time, I see no need for data traffic to originate from a public network to be transmitted over MURS, but there may be an application in the public interest (similar to the NOAA SAME system) in the future. It is my fear that the newly defined terms of a PSTN would encompass and restrict a use of MURS which would be in the interest of the public.

I also understand that store and forward packet systems are not permitted on MURS. I do not wish to allow large volumes of data onto MURS so as to "hog" the channel from other users. I feel that there is a place for data on MURS and that this data may need to be shared via a public network.

Perhaps there is a way to state something to the effect: "data to or from a public network would be permitted only if its duty cycle did not exceed 10% channel utilization." That would certainly give other users a chance to share the channel.

James Johnston